DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 911 JC 920 339

AUTHOR Knight, William E.
TITLE Report of the Results of the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire. Report 1: Background and Composite Results.
INSTITUTION Kent State Univ., OH. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 92
NOTE 72p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Participant Satisfaction; Psychometrics; *Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; *Student Development; Student Educational Objectives; Student Employment; Student Experience; *Student Participation; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS Community College Student Experiences Quest

ABSTRACT

In 1992, the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) was administered in class to a randomly selected group of 1,062 students at the two-year regional campuses of Kent State University (KSU). Specifically, the study sought to provide information about the characteristics, experiences, involvement, gains, and satisfaction of students enrolled in KSU's regional campuses. Comparisons were made between transfer and technology students, and between all KSU students and a nationwide group of students at 24 community colleges for which CCSEQ results were available. Highlighted findings included the following: (1) 75% of the respondents were employed, and 25% were employed more than 30 hours per week; (2) 50% of the respondents indicated that job and family responsibilities took some or much time away from their schoolwork; (3) KSU respondents spent more hours per week studying or preparing for classes than students in the national comparison sample; (4) the majority of respondents were enrolled to prepare to transfer to a four-year college or university, while most of the remainder enrolled to enhance job skills; (5) involvement in in-class and out-of-class activities was generally low for regional campus students, but not unlike that of the national comparison group; (6) student self-reported progress in a number of areas of academic, career, social, and personal development was somewhat below that of the national comparison group, and was significantly lower in the areas of acquiring knowledge and skills appropriate to a specific job or type of work and of understanding and speaking a foreign language; and (7) satisfaction with the college environment, as with the comparison group, was fairly high for students at the regional campuses and was similar across campuses. Thirty tables are presented, including 18 that detail percentages of responses to questionnaire items. (JMC)

ED346911

Report of the Results of the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire Report 1: Background and Composite Results

by
William E. Knight

July, 1992

Kent State University
Regional Campuses

Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services

JC 920 339

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Knight

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

TITLE: REPORT OF THE RESULTS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT EXPERIENCES QUESTIONNAIRE
REPORT 1: BACKGROUND AND COMPOSITE RESULTS

AUTHOR: Dr. William E. Knight, Coordinator, Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services, Regional Campuses

SUBJECT: A Study of the characteristics, experiences, involvement, gains, and satisfaction of Regional Campuses students

DATE: June, 1992

SOURCE OF COPIES: Kent State University Regional Campuses
Lincoln Building
Kent, Ohio 44242
(216) 672-2330

DISTRIBUTION LIST:
President
Provost
Vice Provost for Regional Campuses
Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Members, Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council
Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campuses
Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campuses
Director of Business Affairs, Regional Campuses
Assistant Director of Business Affairs, Regional Campuses
Director of Student Information and Records, Regional Campuses
Regional Campus Deans
Regional Campus Assistant/Associate Deans
Regional Campus Directors of Student Affairs and Registrars
Regional Campuses Faculty Advisory Council
Regional Campus Library Directors
Regional Campus Directors of Public Relations
Regional Campus Career Services Coordinators
Regional Campus Developmental Education Coordinators

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 73

SUMMARY

The Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) is an instrument designed to provide information about the background characteristics, educational goals, levels of involvement in key college activities, self-reported progress, and satisfaction with the college environment of two-year college students. It was administered in-class to a randomly-selected group of Regional Campuses students (N=1,062) who matched the demographic profile and educational aspirations of all students at the campuses. The results are compared and contrasted between transfer and technology students and between all students at the campuses responding to the questionnaire and a nation-wide group of students at twenty-four community colleges for whom CCSEQ results are available.

Seventy-five percent of respondents were employed and twenty-five percent were employed more than thirty hours per week. One out of two reported job and family responsibilities take some or much time away from their school work. Regional Campuses respondents spent more hours per week studying or preparing for classes than students in the comparison group. More than one-half spend less than four hours per week on campus when not in class, although this is greater than for the comparison group. The majority of respondents were enrolled to prepare to transfer to a four-year college or university; most of the remainder enrolled to enhance job skills.

Involvement in in-class and out-of-class activities was generally low for Regional Campuses students, but not unlike that of other students who have taken the CCSEQ. Students at the campuses were significantly less involved than students in the national comparison group in art/music/theater activities, science activities, and vocational skills activities. They were significantly more involved in writing activities. There were differences in involvement in writing activities between females and males and differences in involvement with student acquaintances between younger and older students. Responses were similar across campuses.

Student self-reported progress in a number of areas of academic, career, social, and personal development was somewhat below that for the national comparison group and was significantly lower in the areas of acquiring knowledge and skills appropriate to a specific job or type of work and of understanding and speaking a foreign language. Responses were similar across campuses.

Satisfaction with the college environment, as for the comparison group, was fairly high for students at the campuses and was similar across campuses. Significantly greater satisfaction was seen for older students.

As positive relationships were shown between involvement and student gains, the implications of the study are that the campuses should continue to consider ways in which to promote active learning and to increase the quantity and quality of student participation in learning activities.

CONTENTS

		Page
Abstract		i
Summary		ii
Contents		iii
List of Tables		iv
I. STUDY DESCRIPTION		
A.	Introduction	1
B.	Objectives of the Study	2
C.	Study Design	3
D.	The Instrument	3
E.	Analyses	4
II. RESULTS		
A.	Background, Work, and Family	5
B.	College Program	5
C.	College Courses	8
D.	College Activities	14
E.	Estimates of Gains	34
F.	College Environment	43
G.	Comparisons Between Groups on Involvement in College Activities, Gains, and Satisfaction with the College Environment	46
H.	Relationships Between Selected Variables and Involvement in College Activities, Gains, and Satisfaction with the College Environment	54
I.	Relationships Between Involvement in College Activities and Gains	58
III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS		60
IV. REFERENCES		64
V. APPENDIX: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT EXPERIENCES QUESTIONNAIRE		66

Appendix not included in copy received by ERIC.

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Background, Work, and Family: Percentages of Respondents	6-7
Table 2	College Program: Percentages of Respondents	9-10
Table 3	College Courses: Percentages of Respondents	11-13
Table 4	Course Activities Items: Percentages of Respondents	15-16
Table 5	Library Activities Items: Percentages of Respondents	17-18
Table 6	Faculty Items: Percentages of Respondents	19-20
Table 7	Student Acquaintances Items: Percentages of Respondents	21-22
Table 8	Art, Music, and Theater Activities Items: Percentages of Respondents	23
Table 9	Writing Activities Items: Percentages of Respondents	24-25
Table 10	Science Activities Items: Percentages of Respondents	26-27
Table 11	Vocational Skills Items: Percentages of Respondents	28-29
Table 12	Clubs and Organizations Items: Percentages of Respondents	30
Table 13	Athletic Activities Items: Percentages of Respondents	31
Table 14	Counseling and Career Planning Items: Percentages of Respondents	32
Table 15	Learning and Study Skills Items: Percentages of Respondents	33
Table 16	Estimate of Gains Items: Percentages of Respondents	35-38
Table 17	Percentages of Students Responding They Made "Quite a Lot" or "Very Much" Progress: Regional Campuses Students and National Comparison Group	39-42
Table 18	College Environment: Percentages of Respondents	44-45
Table 19	Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Group	48

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 20	Mean Art, Music, Theater Scores by Group: Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group	49
Table 21	Mean Writing Scores by Group: Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group	49
Table 22	Mean Science Scores by Group: Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group	50
Table 23	Mean Vocational Skills Scores by Group: Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group	50
Table 24	Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Gender	51
Table 25	Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Age	52
Table 26	Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Campus	53
Table 27	Correlations Between Activity Scale Scores, Gains, and Satisfaction and Job Responsibilities	55
Table 28	Correlations Between Activity Scale Scores, Gains, and Satisfaction and Family Responsibilities	56
Table 29	Correlations Between Activity Scale Means and Total Credit Hours	57
Table 30	Correlations Between Gain Factors and College Activity Scale Means	59

I. STUDY DESCRIPTION

A. Introduction

The goal of the Regional Campuses Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services in the area of outcomes assessment is "to systematically gather, examine, and communicate information about students and academic and student services in order to measure achievement, attitudes, and satisfaction as a reflection of the effectiveness of the Regional Campuses in meeting their mission" (Knight, 1991c, p. 5). To this end, a number of indicators, such as student performance on licensing examinations, job placement information, developmental education statistics, retention and student tracking information, and alumni satisfaction (Knight, 1990a) have been considered. Additionally, studies of special student populations such as new freshmen (Knight, 1990b), non-returning students (Knight, 1991b), students who are admitted, but who do not enroll (Knight, 1992), associate degree graduates (Knight, 1990c), and baccalaureate graduates who began at Regional Campuses (Knight, 1991a) have described the characteristics and attitudes of these groups.

Lacking in these studies, however, has been a more in-depth consideration of student involvement, activities, and perceptions which is grounded in research and for which comparative information is available. Tinto (1987) stressed the importance of the relationship between student involvement and retention. He also noted the importance of students becoming integrated into the academic and social fabric of the institution for the successful attainment of goals other than graduation, such as transfer to a senior institution, job re-training, and personal development, at his 1990 visit to the Regional Campuses.

Friedlander (1991) stated the most important determinant of educational success is not "who the student is, but rather, what the student does in college" (p. 12-4). Pace (1984) contends the degree of involvement of students is a reflection on the quality of education being provided by the institution. These two individuals sought to address these issues by developing and utilizing an instrument analogous to the College Student Experiences Questionnaire, which was developed at the University of California, Los Angeles and has been used nationwide for several years, that would be appropriate for two-year college students. The resulting instrument, known as the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ), has been designed, according to Lehman (1992), to answer the following questions:

What are the goals of students who attend the campuses?

How involved are with their educational experience?

How much effort do students put into their college experience with regard to classroom activities, use of the library, interaction with faculty, involvement with other students, cultural activities, etc.?

To what extent are students involved in science or writing activities, or in developing their vocational skills?

How do students view the environment at the campuses?

Towards which important educational goals do students report progress or gain?

and

How do students in different groups and at different campuses compare in their experiences, views of the environment, and educational gains?

A pilot edition of the CCSEQ was first used at eleven community colleges in 1989. The first published edition of the instrument became available in 1990, and a total of forty-eight two-year colleges had used the questionnaire as of March 1992. The CCSEQ has continued to gain the attention of two-year college faculty and staff nationwide. Douzenis and Murrell (1992) stated

> The CCSEQ can be an effective tool for use in strategic planning efforts--both institution-wide and department specific. Information from the CCSEQ can also be targeted to faculty groups for use in program development, evaluation, and improvement (e.g. sharing student efforts in writing with English faculty members). In summary, use of the CCSEQ can enhance current planning, assessment and institutional effectiveness activities as well as provide impetus for curriculum evaluation and program development. (p. 3)

Recognizing that the results of the CCSEQ could lend valuable information to the body of research about Regional Campuses students and the effectiveness of the campuses in meeting their goals, the instrument was administered to a group of students in the spring of 1992. The following information includes the results of the CCSEQ and discussion and conclusions.

B. Objectives of the Study

The CCSEQ was administered as part of a systematic effort to learn more about Regional Campuses students and assess the outcomes of their educational experiences at the campuses. Specifically, the study sought to provide additional information about the characteristics, experiences, involvement, gains, and satisfaction of Regional Campuses students.

C. Study Design

Following the recommendations of the CCSEQ authors, it was decided that the instrument would be administered in class to randomly selected but representative students. Campus registrars identified class sections which offered a cross-section of students with respect to majors and degree programs, gender, full-time/part-time status, lower-division/upper-division status, and day/evening attendance. Sufficient sections were identified to provide for a final sample of approximately 1,000 students across the seven campuses. Faculty teaching those sections were contacted and asked to aid the study by providing twenty to thirty minutes of class time for administration of the CCSEQ. The CCSEQ was administered during the week of February 24-28, 1992. The completed questionnaires were sent to the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation for data input and preliminary analyses. The number of questionnaires represented in the analyses was 1,062.

D. The Instrument

According to Lehman (1992) the content of the CCSEQ focuses upon four questions:

1. Who are students and why are they at the campuses?

2. What do they do at the campuses, or more specifically, how extensively and productively do they use the facilities and opportunities the campuses provide?

3. What are some of their impressions about the campuses?

and

4. What progress do they think they have made toward important goals?

The instrument is comprised of five sections. The first contains demographic questions and items about work and family, enrollment status, and primary reason for enrollment. The second section asks about students' degree programs and majors, plans for transfer, and the number of courses students have taken in subjects such as sciences, English composition, and foreign languages. The third section contains questions about student activities and involvement. These questions are grouped into twelve scales which include Course Activities, Library Activities, Faculty, Student Acquaintances, Art/Music/Theater Activities, Writing Activities, Science Activities, Vocational Skills, Clubs and Organizations, Athletic Activities, Counseling and Career Planning, and Learning and Study Skills. The fourth section of the CCSEQ asks students to estimate the degree to which they have gained or made progress in a variety of activities. The fifth section of the instrument contains questions about students' satisfaction with the college environment.

An additional portion of the instrument allowed students' campuses to be identified. The questionnaire also allowed for the comparison of data among a variety of groups.

E. Analyses

A listing of response frequencies was received from UCLA along with the raw data. Responses were compared and contrasted across groups within the sample and with comparative information from a nation-wide sample set of 7,683 students at twenty-four two-year colleges supplied by UCLA. The comparative information from UCLA is accompanied by a caveat that the instrument is too new for this to be considered true norming information; it is only a rough estimate of what is happening at other institutions.

The results of the present study are primarily reported for three groups: all students, transfer students, and technology students. The information for all students is the composite information for the entire sample (N=1062). The information for transfer students is based on the group of students who responded their primary reason for enrollment was to prepare to transfer to a four year college or university (N=497). The information for technology students is based on the group of students who responded their primary reason for enrollment was to gain skills necessary to enter a new job or occupation or to gain skills necessary to remain current or advance in a current job or occupation and who responded they were enrolled in an occupational/vocational program (N=214). Please note technology students thus include students in AA, AAS, or ATS programs both in the School of Technology and in the nursing, health-related, and environmental areas. Since the transfer and technology groups do not together include the entire sample and since the two groups are not entirely mutually exclusive, comparisons of results between groups were made, but statistical tests for significant differences between them are not appropriate.

Along with the percentages of students responding to the different options of each item, means were also computed for the activity/involvement scales and the gain and satisfaction scores. Comparisons of means were made between the sample and the national comparative information and among the seven campuses. The relationships between involvement, gains, and satisfaction and variables such as gender, age, total credit hours, and job and family responsibilities were explored.

This report represents the composite CCSEQ results for the seven campuses and is one of a group of reports which also provide the CCSEQ results for each campus as well as for topic areas, such as Student Experiences with Writing, Student Use of the Library, and Student Interactions with Faculty.

II. RESULTS

A. Background, Work, and Family

Students responding to the CCSEQ generally matched the profile of all Regional Campuses students with respect to age, gender, ethnicity, and employment. Fifty-five percent of questionnaire respondents were age twenty-two or younger while about thirty percent of all students are age twenty-one or younger. Thirty-five percent of respondents were male compared to thirty-seven percent of all students. Seven percent of respondents compared to four percent of all students were minorities. Seventy-five percent of students were employed; past research showed seventy to eighty percent of all students are employed. Almost one-fourth of respondents report they are employed thirty or more hours per week. One-half of all respondents say job or family responsibilities take some or a lot of time away from school work. The percentages of students from each campus who responded to the CCSEQ generally matched the percentages of total students who attend each campus; Ashtabula and Tuscarawas were slightly under-represented and Stark and Trumbull were slightly over-represented.

The patterns of responses were similar across groups except that transfer students tended to be younger than technology students and thirty-one percent of technology students as opposed to twenty-one percent of transfer students reported they had no job. Regional Campuses students were more often female, Caucasian, and native English speaking than the national comparison group. Other responses were similar to those for the national comparison group. These results are shown in **Table 1.**

B. College Program

Sixty-nine percent of respondents as compared to forty-five percent of all current students were enrolled full-time. Sixty percent of respondents had thirty or fewer credit hours completed including the current term; this compares to about fifty percent of all students having freshmen status (thirty-two or fewer credit hours). The largest percentage of respondents (44%) had both day and evening classes. Over eighty percent of respondents said most of their grades had been C+ or better. Twenty-eight percent of respondents spend less than six hours per week preparing for class while thirty-six percent spend more than ten hours per week. Twenty-one percent of students responding to the CCSEQ spend no time at all on campus when not in class while twenty-three percent spent more than six hours per week on campus when not in class. Fifty-three percent of respondents reported their most important reason for attending was to prepare to transfer to a four-year college or university. An additional forty-three percent said their most important reason for attending was to gain the skills necessary to enter a new job or to retrain, remain current, or advance in the current job.

Table 1
Background, Work and Family: Percentages of Responses

	Item	All	Group: Transfer	Group: Technology
1.	Age			
	18-19 or younger	27.8	38.2	19.2
	20-22	27.6	33.0	22.4
	23-27	13.9	12.3	13.6
	28-39	23.8	14.4	33.6
	40-55	6.6	1.9	11.2
	Over 55	0.3	0.2	0.0
2.	Gender			
	Male	34.5	39.6	27.8
	Female	65.5	60.4	72.2
3.	Ethnicity			
	Amer. Ind.	0.4	0.4	0.5
	Asian Amer.	1.0	0.8	0.9
	African Amer.	3.1	3.2	2.3
	Hispanic Amer.	1.1	1.5	0.5
	Caucasian	93.4	93.0	94.9
	Other	1.0	1.1	0.9
4.	Native language is English			
	Yes	98.2	99.0	97.7
	No	1.8	1.0	2.3
5.	Hours per week spent working on a job			
	None, no job	25.1	21.1	31.4
	1-10 hours	8.0	7.7	6.5
	11-20 hours	20.6	27.2	15.4
	21-30 hours	19.6	22.0	15.9
	31-40 hours	17.4	15.1	20.1
	More than 40 hours	9.3	6.9	10.7

Table 1 (continued)
Background, Work and Family: Percentages of Responses

	Item	All	Group: Transfer	Group: Technology
6.	How job affects college work			
	No job	24.0	20.6	30.0
	Job does not interfere with school work	19.9	20.6	20.0
	Job takes some time from school work	44.0	48.9	35.7
	Job takes a lot of time from school work	12.1	9.9	14.3
7.	How family responsibilities affect college work			
	No family responsibilities	26.2	31.4	18.2
	Responsibilities do not interfere with school work	24.3	27.6	24.3
	Responsibilities take some time from school work	35.8	31.4	40.7
	Responsibilities take a lot of time from school work	13.7	9.6	16.8
8.	Campus			
	Ashtabula	7.1	4.6	12.1
	East Liverpool	8.0	5.2	11.7
	Geauga	8.1	9.2	7.9
	Salem	11.3	9.2	16.9
	Stark	30.7	39.0	12.6
	Trumbull	23.6	25.3	15.4
	Tuscarawas	11.2	7.5	23.4

Responses tended to be similar across groups and with national comparative information except that Regional Campuses students tended to be enrolled full-time more often than students in the comparison group and transfer students tended to have more day only classes than technology students. Regional Campuses students spent more hours per week studying and preparing for classes than did students in the comparison group. Regional Campuses students also spent more hours per week on campus when not in class; twenty-three percent spent more than six hours per week on campus outside of class as opposed to nineteen percent for students in the comparison group. This information is shown in **Table 2.**

C. College Courses

Students responding to the CCSEQ were asked how many courses they had taken in ten general education categories. The largest percentage of students said they had taken more than one course in social sciences and English composition, one course in sciences and college mathematics, and no courses in fine arts, humanities, foreign languages, speech communications, computer science, and physical or health education. Transfer students took more courses in each category except computer science. Regional Campuses students, on average, took more courses in sciences, social sciences, college mathematics, English composition, and speech communications than students in the national comparison group, but students in the comparison group took more classes, on average, in fine arts, humanities, foreign languages, computer science, and physical and health education.

Forty-three percent of respondents reported they were working for an AA or AS degree and seventy percent said they were working for a diploma. Seventy-four percent plan to transfer to a four-year college or university and twenty-two percent said they were currently enrolled in a technology program. Forty-five percent of technology students were enrolled in the business technology programs, thirty-seven percent in the health technologies, fourteen percent in the engineering technologies, and three percent in other programs; this reflects existing information on declared majors. This information is shown in **Table 3.**

Table 2
College Program: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group		
		All	Transfer	Technology
1.	Number of credit hours taking this semester			
	Less than 6	8.1	5.0	7.9
	6-8	13.9	12.1	16.4
	9-11	9.5	7.1	14.5
	12-15	57.0	59.9	53.7
	More than 15	11.5	15.9	7.5
2.	Total credit hours taken at Kent State University			
	1-15	21.9	19.0	13.6
	16-30	38.1	38.1	43.9
	31-45	20.0	22.4	22.9
	46 or more	20.0	20.5	19.6
3.	Meeting times of classes			
	Day only	37.7	44.1	25.2
	Evening only	18.3	12.6	26.6
	Some day, some evening	44.0	43.3	48.2
4.	Most of my grades have been			
	A	11.0	10.7	11.8
	A-,B+	22.2	21.2	25.9
	B	23.6	25.7	24.6
	B-,C+	25.8	25.0	25.0
	C,C-	9.0	9.9	6.6
	Lower than C-	1.2	0.6	0.9
	No grades; this is my first semester	7.2	6.9	5.2

Table 2 (continued)
College Program: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group: All	Transfer	Technology
5.	Hours per week spent studying or preparing for classes			
	1-5	27.8	31.1	22.6
	6-10	36.5	36.5	33.5
	11-15	21.1	21.3	23.6
	16-20	9.9	7.3	13.7
	More than 20	4.7	3.8	6.6
6.	Hours per week spent on campus not in class			
	None	20.9	20.5	18.2
	1-3	35.4	35.2	33.1
	4-6	20.4	21.5	19.2
	7-9	9.2	9.2	11.2
	10-12	5.1	5.0	4.7
	More than 12	9.0	8.6	13.6
7.	Most important reason for attending this campus at this time			
	To prepare to transfer to a four-year college or university	53.2	100.0	17.8
	To gain skills necessary to enter a new job or occupation	36.4	0.0	66.3
	To gain skills necessary to retrain, remain current, or advance in a current job or occupation	7.3	0.0	15.9
	To satisfy a personal interest	2.7	0.0	0.0
	To improve English, reading, or skills	0.4	0.0	0.0

Table 3
College Courses: Percentages of Responses

Item		Group		
		All	Transfer	Technology
1.	Number of courses taken in each general education area			
	Sciences			
	None	41.4	33.7	51.1
	One	27.8	31.8	22.1
	More than one	30.8	34.5	26.8
	Social Sciences			
	None	13.8	9.6	15.9
	One	30.7	31.2	32.7
	More than one	55.5	59.2	51.4
	Fine Arts			
	None	64.1	55.0	81.0
	One	23.6	29.7	13.8
	More than one	12.3	15.3	5.2
	College Math			
	None	27.4	24.6	30.2
	One	41.4	39.2	42.9
	More than one	31.2	36.2	26.9
	English Composition			
	None	11.5	8.4	13.6
	One	28.6	23.1	31.8
	More than one	59.9	68.5	54.6

Table 3 (continued)
College Courses: Percentages of Responses

Item	Group: All	Transfer	Technology
1. Number of courses taken in each general education area (continued)			
Humanities			
None	46.6	33.1	64.9
One	23.3	28.0	20.2
More than one	30.1	38.9	14.9
Foreign Languages			
None	91.6	89.3	95.7
One	4.7	5.8	1.9
More than one	3.7	4.9	2.4
Speech Communications			
None	51.0	49.5	51.2
One	41.1	44.6	38.0
More than one	7.9	5.9	10.8
Computer Science			
None	67.5	74.3	47.1
One	25.1	22.3	36.6
More than one	7.4	3.4	16.3
Physical or Health Education			
None	71.0	67.9	79.3
One	17.9	20.6	11.6
More than one	11.1	11.5	9.1

Table 3 (continued)
College Courses: Percentages of Responses

Item		Group		
		All	Transfer	Technology
2.	Working for AA or AS degree			
	Yes	43.5	23.8	72.5
	No	56.5	76.2	26.5
3.	Working for a diploma			
	Yes	70.2	67.9	75.1
	No	29.8	32.1	24.9
4.	Plan to transfer to a four year college or university			
	Yes	74.2	100.0	43.5
	No	25.8	0.0	56.5
5.	Currently enrolled in a technology program			
	Yes	22.3	0.0	100.0
	No	77.7	100.0	0.0
6.	Category of technology program			
	Not enrolled in a tech. program	55.5	100.0	0.0
	Business/Marketing	19.4	0.0	45.0
	Health	16.2	0.0	37.4
	Technical/Industrial	5.7	0.0	14.2
	Other	3.2	0.0	3.4

D. College Activities

Tables four through fifteen show the percentages of students responding very often, often, occasionally, or never to each item in the twelve college activity scales. The profile of responses is generally similar between transfer and technology students and between all Regional Campuses students and the comparison group. Regional campuses students reported more involvement in writing activities and slightly more involvement with student acquaintances than the national comparison group. Additionally, transfer students reported more involvement with writing activities than technology students. Regional Campuses students had somewhat less involvement in art, music, and theater activities, science activities, vocational skills, and athletic activities than students in the comparison group. Transfer students had more involvement in art, music, and theater activities than technology students while technology students had more involvement in science and vocational skills. Within the counseling and career planning items, technology students were more likely to have discussed vocational interests and abilities with a counselor or advisor, while transfer students were more likely to have read information about four-year colleges, discussed transfer plans with a counselor or advisor, and to have identified courses needed to meet the general education requirements of a four-year college or university.

Table 4
Course Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Participated in class discussions	All	3.0	46.0	33.8	17.2
2.	Worked on a paper or project which combined ideas from different sources of information	All	11.9	36.9	38.5	12.7
3.	Summarized major points and information from readings or notes	All	4.2	26.6	47.7	21.5
4.	Tried to explain the material to another student	All	6.0	48.2	34.0	11.8
5.	Did additional readings on topics that were introduced and discussed in class	All	26.1	53.8	16.0	4.1
6.	Asked questions about points in class discussions or readings	All	10.9	48.4	32.0	8.7
7.	Studied course materials with other students	All	21.3	41.7	26.0	11.0

Table 4 (continued)
Course Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
8.	Applied principles and concepts learned in class to understand other problems or situations	All	7.7	48.8	33.2	10.3
9.	Compared and contrasted different points of view presented in a course	All	9.8	48.1	34.0	8.1
10.	Considered the accuracy and credibility of information from different sources	All	14.8	48.9	28.3	8.0

Table 5
Library Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Use the library as a quiet place to read or study material you brought with you	All	24.4	39.7	20.6	15.3
		Transfer	24.6	38.1	21.9	15.4
		Technology	24.9	40.3	18.8	16.0
2.	Read newspapers, magazines, or journals located in the library	All	37.7	41.6	15.4	5.3
		Transfer	40.3	38.8	16.1	4.8
		Technology	31.3	47.2	15.9	5.6
3.	Checked out books to read at home	All	50.2	35.5	11.1	3.2
		Transfer	49.4	36.5	10.6	3.5
		Technology	53.3	32.7	11.2	2.8
4.	Use the card catalog or computer to find books the library had on a topic	All	23.6	42.0	25.5	8.9
		Transfer	21.3	40.7	28.8	9.2
		Technology	25.2	41.2	22.9	10.7
5.	Prepared a bibliography or set of references for a term paper or report	All	34.6	39.6	19.3	6.5
		Transfer	32.6	40.0	20.7	6.7
		Technology	33.6	39.3	19.2	7.9
6.	Asked the librarian for help in finding materials for some topic	All	31.5	45.3	18.0	5.2
		Transfer	33.6	44.0	18.0	4.4
		Technology	29.9	44.8	20.6	4.7

Table 5 (continued)
Library Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
7.	Found some interesting material to read just by browsing in the stacks	All	49.2	36.7	11.0	3.1
		Transfer	51.8	35.9	9.8	2.5
		Technology	46.7	38.8	11.7	2.8

Table 6
Faculty Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Asked an instructor for information about grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.	All	9.7	58.9	24.7	6.7
		Transfer	9.2	56.5	28.0	6.3
		Technology	8.9	63.5	22.0	5.6
2.	Talked briefly with an instructor after class about course content	All	16.6	54.5	23.2	5.7
		Transfer	16.1	55.3	22.8	5.8
		Technology	17.3	55.6	22.4	4.7
3.	Made an appointment to meet with an instructor	All	33.8	49.4	13.5	3.3
		Transfer	35.9	46.5	13.8	3.8
		Technology	31.8	56.5	10.3	1.4
4.	Discussed ideas for a term paper or other class project with an instructor	All	26.1	53.1	17.1	3.7
		Transfer	23.8	55.1	16.5	4.6
		Technology	32.7	49.5	15.9	1.9
5.	Discussed career and/or educational plans, interests, and ambitions with an instructor	All	38.0	46.8	11.6	3.6
		Transfer	37.4	48.8	11.1	2.7
		Technology	36.0	46.7	13.6	3.7
6.	Discussed comments an instructor made on a test or paper	All	28.2	51.6	17.3	2.9
		Transfer	28.5	53.1	15.9	2.5
		Technology	26.6	52.8	18.7	1.9

Table 6 (continued)
Faculty Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
7.	Talked informally with an instructor about current events, campus activities, or other common interests	All	36.2	44.2	15.6	4.0
		Transfer	36.4	44.4	15.9	3.3
		Technology	33.2	45.3	16.4	5.1
8.	Discussed school performance, school difficulties, or other personal problems with an instructor	All	51.0	37.4	9.4	2.2
		Transfer	52.4	37.5	8.6	1.5
		Technology	52.6	35.2	9.9	2.3

Table 7
Student Acquaintances Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Had serious discussions with students who are much older or younger	All	17.2	45.9	25.8	11.1
		Transfer	16.5	43.7	28.7	11.1
		Technology	15.8	48.6	22.8	12.8
2.	Had serious discussions with students of different ethnic or cultural backgrounds	All	34.5	44.5	16.1	4.9
		Transfer	32.8	43.4	18.2	5.6
		Technology	42.1	42.5	12.1	3.3
3.	Had serious discussions with students whose philosophy of life or personal values were very different	All	27.3	46.2	18.8	7.7
		Transfer	22.8	46.3	22.8	8.1
		Technology	31.3	45.3	15.9	7.5
4.	Had serious discussions with students whose political opinions were very different	All	40.6	41.0	13.1	5.3
		Transfer	34.6	42.4	16.1	6.9
		Technology	49.5	37.4	10.3	2.8
5.	Had serious discussions with students whose religious beliefs are very different	All	42.5	38.1	11.9	7.5
		Transfer	37.8	38.6	14.6	9.0
		Technology	49.1	35.5	8.4	7.0

Table 7 (continued)
Student Acquaintances Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
6.	Had serious discussions with students from a different country	All	68.1	25.0	4.3	2.6
		Transfer	66.2	26.5	5.0	2.3
		Technology	72.0	22.9	3.7	1.4

Table 8
Art, Music, and Theater Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Talked about art (painting, sculpture, artists, etc.) with other students	All	64.6	27.7	5.4	2.3
		Transfer	60.0	31.2	6.3	2.5
		Technology	69.6	26.2	2.8	1.4
2.	Talked about music (classical, popular, musicians, etc.) with other students	All	40.0	39.3	15.1	5.6
		Transfer	34.0	40.6	18.7	6.7
		Technology	47.2	37.4	11.7	3.7
3.	Talked about theater (plays, musicals, dance, etc.) with other students	All	61.4	30.3	6.0	2.3
		Transfer	57.7	31.9	7.5	2.9
		Technology	68.1	27.2	3.8	0.9
4.	Attended an art exhibit on the campus	All	78.4	17.2	2.9	1.5
		Transfer	74.6	19.5	3.8	2.1
		Technology	85.8	14.2	0.0	0.0
5.	Attended a concert or other musical event on campus	All	75.1	18.9	4.1	1.9
		Transfer	75.5	18.6	4.0	1.9
		Technology	77.0	19.2	3.3	0.5
6.	Attended a play, dance concert, or other theater performance on campus	All	76.0	18.5	4.1	1.4
		Transfer	74.2	20.1	3.8	1.9
		Technology	81.4	15.4	2.3	0.9

Table 9
Writing Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Used a dictionary to look up the proper meaning, definition, and/or spelling of words	All	4.9	26.0	36.5	32.6
		Transfer	4.4	25.6	37.0	33.0
		Technology	5.6	27.6	37.4	29.4
2.	Prepared an outline to organize the sequence of ideas and points in a paper	All	10.5	33.5	35.7	20.3
		Transfer	11.3	34.4	33.6	20.7
		Technology	12.1	31.3	37.4	19.2
3.	Thought about grammar, sentence structure, paragraphs, and word choice while writing	All	4.0	16.3	42.7	37.0
		Transfer	3.3	16.1	43.2	37.4
		Technology	6.1	14.5	43.9	35.5
4.	Wrote a rough draft of a paper or essay and revised it before handing it in	All	5.9	12.5	34.7	46.9
		Transfer	4.8	11.9	35.6	47.7
		Technology	7.5	12.6	34.6	45.3
5.	Used a computer (word processor) to write or type a paper	All	24.7	16.6	17.9	40.8
		Transfer	22.8	15.7	18.0	43.5
		Technology	26.2	14.5	17.3	42.0
6.	Asked other people to read something you wrote to see if it was clear to them	All	12.3	29.4	32.5	25.8
		Transfer	10.0	32.2	31.6	26.2
		Technology	13.6	24.3	38.7	23.4

Table 9 (continued)
Writing Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
7.	Spent at least 5 hours or more writing a paper	All	17.4	24.5	26.0	32.1
		Transfer	15.4	23.4	26.1	35.1
		Technology	21.0	26.6	23.4	29.0
8.	Asked an instructor for advice and help to improve your writing or about a comment he/she made on a paper you wrote	All	21.3	39.7	24.8	14.2
		Transfer	20.0	40.1	25.3	14.6
		Technology	19.6	43.5	24.8	12.1

Table 10
Science Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Memorized formulas, definitions, technical terms	All	24.8	25.2	32.0	18.0
		Transfer	23.4	26.3	34.6	15.7
		Technology	26.4	20.3	30.2	23.1
2.	Practiced to improve skills in using laboratory equipment	All	71.5	14.8	9.8	3.9
		Transfer	75.1	14.5	7.3	3.1
		Technology	61.0	16.9	16.4	5.7
3.	Showed a classmate how to use a piece of laboratory equipment	All	76.3	14.5	6.0	3.2
		Transfer	79.3	13.2	4.8	2.7
		Technology	69.4	18.8	8.5	3.3
4.	Attempted to explain an experimental procedure to a classmate	All	72.3	18.8	6.0	2.9
		Transfer	72.0	20.0	4.8	3.2
		Technology	70.3	19.3	7.1	3.3
5.	Tested understanding of some scientific principle by seeing if you could explain it to another student	All	67.1	22.0	8.0	2.9
		Transfer	68.3	20.8	7.8	3.1
		Technology	65.7	23.5	7.0	3.8
6.	Completed an experiment/project using scientific methods	All	71.9	17.9	7.8	2.4
		Transfer	73.0	17.8	6.9	2.3
		Technology	71.5	15.2	9.5	3.8

Table 10 (continued)
Science Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
7.	Talked about social and ethical issues related to science and technology such as energy, pollution, chemicals, genetics, etc.	All	49.3	35.1	11.6	4.0
		Transfer	45.7	36.3	13.2	4.8
		Technology	56.8	31.5	9.4	2.3
8.	Used information learned in a science class to understand some aspect of the world around you	All	46.9	32.1	15.2	5.8
		Transfer	44.2	34.4	14.5	6.9
		Technology	54.5	26.5	15.2	3.8
9.	Tried to explain to someone the scientific basis for environmental concerns about pollution, recycling, alternative forms of energy, etc.	All	55.3	29.9	10.2	4.6
		Transfer	53.2	31.7	10.9	4.2
		Technology	60.6	26.3	8.9	4.2

Table 11
Vocational Skills Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Read about how to perform a procedure (occupational task, vocational skill)	All	39.1	29.1	20.9	10.9
		Transfer	55.6	25.9	14.1	4.4
		Technology	24.7	29.1	27.4	18.8
2.	Listened to an instructor explain how to perform a procedure	All	29.9	19.2	29.0	21.9
		Transfer	48.1	20.2	17.7	14.0
		Technology	16.7	16.1	35.5	31.7
3.	Watched an instructor demonstrate how to do a procedure	All	32.4	20.0	29.5	18.1
		Transfer	49.6	17.6	24.0	8.8
		Technology	18.9	21.6	34.1	25.4
4.	Practiced a procedure while being monitored by an instructor or another student	All	47.8	23.9	16.9	11.4
		Transfer	61.3	21.0	12.1	5.6
		Technology	37.8	27.6	18.9	15.7
5.	Practiced a procedure without supervision	All	45.0	23.4	19.3	12.3
		Transfer	60.2	17.9	13.8	8.1
		Technology	34.0	26.5	23.8	15.7
6.	Identified that there was a problem and located information from an instructor or other resource about what to do	All	47.0	28.4	16.0	8.6
		Transfer	61.3	27.4	7.3	4.0
		Technology	38.0	28.3	21.7	12.0

Table 11 (continued)
Vocational Skills Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasionally	often	very often
7.	Diagnosed a problem and carried out the appropriate procedure without having to consult any resource	All	50.9	27.9	14.2	7.0
		Transfer	61.0	23.5	12.2	3.3
		Technology	42.7	30.8	17.3	9.2

Table 12
Clubs and Organizations Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Looked in the student newspaper or on bulletin boards for notices about campus events and student organizations	All	20.2	42.0	25.7	12.1
		Transfer	18.0	41.1	28.3	12.6
		Technology	23.1	42.0	24.5	10.4
2.	Read or asked about a student club or organization	All	42.9	42.0	9.6	5.5
		Transfer	40.0	43.6	10.5	5.9
		Technology	47.9	38.5	9.4	4.2
3.	Attended a meeting of a student club or organization	All	77.5	14.0	3.8	4.7
		Transfer	77.0	14.2	4.8	4.0
		Technology	77.9	13.1	2.8	6.2

Table 13
Athletic Activities Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	never	occasi-onally	often	very often
1.	Followed a regular schedule of or practice in some sport on campus	All	75.7	10.7	6.9	6.7
		Transfer	74.3	11.8	6.3	7.6
		Technology	78.9	9.9	5.6	5.6
2.	Sought instruction to improve performance in some athletic activity	All	81.1	10.2	4.5	4.2
		Transfer	79.8	10.1	4.6	5.5
		Technology	84.5	8.5	4.2	2.8
3.	Attended an athletic event on the campus	All	81.0	11.2	3.3	4.5
		Transfer	77.3	13.0	3.8	5.9
		Technology	86.3	9.0	1.9	2.8

Table 14
Counseling and Career Planning: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	Yes	No
1.	Talked with a counselor/advisor about courses to take, requirements, educational plans	All	88.4	11.6
		Transfer	86.8	13.2
		Technology	91.6	8.4
2.	Discussed vocational interests, abilities and ambitions with a counselor/advisor	All	60.4	39.6
		Transfer	49.3	50.7
		Technology	76.2	23.8
3.	Read information about a four-year college or university that you were interested in attending	All	71.2	28.8
		Transfer	86.4	13.6
		Technology	55.1	44.9
4.	Read materials about career opportunities	All	84.1	15.9
		Transfer	83.2	16.8
		Technology	85.5	14.5
5.	Made an appointment with a counselor or an advisor to discuss plans for transferring to a four-year college or university	All	30.4	69.6
		Transfer	40.3	59.7
		Technology	17.8	82.2
6.	Identified courses needed to meet the general education requirements of a four-year college or university you are interested in attending	All	70.1	29.9
		Transfer	86.8	13.2
		Technology	47.2	52.8
7.	Talked with a counselor/advisor about personal matters related to your college performance	All	38.4	61.6
		Transfer	35.4	64.6
		Technology	45.3	54.7

Table 15
Learning and Study Skills: Percentages of Responses

Item	Group	None	Some	A lot
Received instruction in each of the following areas:				
Memory skills	All	21.1	60.3	18.6
	Transfer	18.9	64.3	16.8
	Technology	20.7	59.6	19.7
Notetaking skills	All	21.9	51.7	26.4
	Transfer	21.2	53.8	25.0
	Technology	20.1	50.9	29.0
Listening skills	All	19.7	53.6	26.7
	Transfer	19.1	56.0	24.9
	Technology	16.8	52.8	30.4
Speaking skills	All	29.3	47.0	23.7
	Transfer	27.0	48.6	24.4
	Technology	29.0	47.6	23.4
Writing skills	All	9.8	38.6	51.6
	Transfer	9.9	37.0	53.1
	Technology	9.3	37.9	52.8
Reading skills	All	21.9	49.4	28.7
	Transfer	22.3	51.9	25.8
	Technology	20.6	47.2	32.2
Test taking skills	All	19.9	56.6	23.5
	Transfer	18.4	58.3	23.3
	Technology	15.0	57.5	27.5
Time management skills	All	23.5	54.8	21.7
	Transfer	23.0	56.0	21.0
	Technology	21.0	55.1	23.9
Problem solving skills	All	20.8	58.3	20.9
	Transfer	21.4	59.2	19.4
	Technology	17.4	56.8	25.8

E. Estimates of Gains

Respondents were asked to estimate how much (very much, quite a bit, some, or very little) they had gained or made progress in twenty-three areas as a result of their college attendance. The results are shown in **Table 16**. The pattern of responses was similar overall between transfer and technology students.

Table 17 compares the percentage of Regional Campuses students and those in the comparison group of students that said they had made quite a bit or very much progress in each gain area. Differences greater than five percentage points were seen in eight items. Fifty-one percent of the comparison group, but thirty-six percent of Regional Campuses students said they had made quite a bit or very much progress in acquiring the knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work. Nineteen percent of students in the comparison group, but nine percent of Regional Campuses students gave the same responses to the item dealing with developing the ability to speak and understand another language. The greatest difference was in the area of writing clearly and effectively, where fifty-eight percent of Regional Campuses students, but only twenty-one percent of students in the comparison group said they had improved quite a bit or very much.

Table 16
Estimate of Gains Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	very little	some	quite a bit	very much
1.	Acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work	All	20.2	43.7	26.4	9.7
		Transfer	22.4	47.7	22.0	7.9
		Technology	12.2	34.7	36.6	16.5
2.	Gaining information about career opportunities	All	15.5	46.9	30.4	7.2
		Transfer	17.8	47.9	27.8	6.5
		Technology	9.4	48.1	33.0	9.5
3.	Developing clearer career goals	All	16.0	34.5	35.5	14.0
		Transfer	19.0	31.8	34.5	14.7
		Technology	9.9	37.1	37.6	15.4
4.	Becoming acquainted with different fields of knowledge	All	9.7	37.9	39.2	13.2
		Transfer	9.5	36.6	40.6	13.3
		Technology	8.5	37.1	38.4	16.0
5.	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and theater	All	51.0	28.4	13.2	7.4
		Transfer	44.9	29.3	15.6	10.2
		Technology	62.7	26.9	7.5	2.9
6.	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature (novels, stories, essays, poetry, etc.)	All	25.5	38.3	22.7	13.5
		Transfer	22.1	37.3	25.1	15.5
		Technology	34.3	38.0	18.8	8.9
7.	Writing clearly and effectively	All	9.0	33.0	40.5	17.5
		Transfer	9.9	32.1	39.4	18.6
		Technology	8.5	31.9	45.1	14.5

Table 16 (continued)
Estimate of Gains Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	very little	some	quite a bit	very much
8.	Presenting ideas and information effectively in speaking to others	All	18.4	39.3	32.7	9.6
		Transfer	20.3	36.5	32.7	10.5
		Technology	14.6	42.3	32.4	10.7
9.	Acquiring the ability to use computers	All	33.0	27.2	23.3	16.5
		Transfer	35.0	29.1	21.6	14.3
		Technology	28.6	22.1	25.4	23.9
10.	Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life	All	22.3	40.3	26.3	11.1
		Transfer	19.3	40.7	28.9	11.1
		Technology	28.2	38.5	24.4	8.9
11.	Becoming clearer about my own values and ethical standards	All	16.6	35.3	33.6	14.5
		Transfer	16.8	34.9	34.0	14.3
		Technology	16.4	36.6	30.5	16.5
12.	Understanding myself-my abilities and interests	All	9.7	31.5	39.3	19.5
		Transfer	10.1	34.2	38.9	16.8
		Technology	8.5	27.7	40.8	23.0
13.	Understanding mathematical concepts such as probabilities, proportions, etc.	All	23.8	37.6	28.8	9.8
		Transfer	22.9	37.3	29.8	10.0
		Technology	23.6	37.3	25.0	14.1
14.	Understanding the role of science and technology in society	All	26.3	40.5	24.6	8.6
		Transfer	27.4	41.5	22.9	8.2
		Technology	23.1	42.5	23.6	10.8

Table 16 (continued)
Estimate of Gains Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	very little	some	quite a bit	very much
15.	Putting ideas together to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas	All	11.7	43.0	34.1	11.2
		Transfer	13.2	41.9	35.2	9.7
		Technology	6.6	46.5	33.8	13.1
16.	Developing the ability to learn on my own, pursue ideas, and find information I need	All	7.7	30.5	41.5	20.3
		Transfer	9.0	30.0	41.4	19.6
		Technology	4.2	26.4	45.8	23.6
17.	Developing the ability to speak and understand another language	All	77.7	13.5	5.6	3.2
		Transfer	73.6	16.2	6.8	3.4
		Technology	85.9	8.9	3.3	1.9
18.	Interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, textbooks, and on TV	All	28.2	40.7	23.0	8.1
		Transfer	29.3	39.2	23.8	7.7
		Technology	25.9	42.0	22.6	9.5
19.	Developing an interest in political and economic events	All	38.3	35.1	19.3	7.5
		Transfer	33.9	36.0	21.3	8.8
		Technology	44.6	31.5	19.2	4.7
20.	Seeing the importance of history for understanding the present as well as the past	All	30.3	38.1	20.5	11.1
		Transfer	24.9	40.7	20.7	13.7
		Technology	40.1	33.5	20.3	6.1

Table 16 (continued)
Estimate of Gains Items: Percentages of Responses

	Item	Group	very little	some	quite a bit	very much
21.	Learning more about other parts of the world and other people (Asia, Africa, South America, etc.)	All	45.1	32.1	15.1	7.7
		Transfer	37.6	36.3	18.1	8.0
		Technology	60.6	22.5	12.2	4.7
22.	Understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people	All	15.2	36.9	31.2	16.7
		Transfer	13.7	36.6	32.4	17.3
		Technology	15.0	34.7	34.3	16.0
23.	Developing good health habits and physical fitness	All	34.2	34.3	19.1	12.4
		Transfer	32.8	35.7	20.2	11.3
		Technology	38.0	28.2	23.5	10.3

Table 17
Percentages of Students Reporting They Made "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much" Progress: RC Students and National Comparison Group

	Item	Regional Campus Students	Comparison Group
1.	Acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work	36%	51%
2.	Gaining information about career opportunities	38%	43%
3.	Developing clearer career goals	50%	51%
4.	Becoming acquainted with different fields of knowledge	52%	54%
5.	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and theater	21%	26%
6.	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature (novels, stories, essays, poetry, etc.)	36%	30%
7.	Writing clearly and effectively	58%	21%

Table 17 (continued)
Percentages of Students Reporting They Made "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much" Progress: RC Students and National Comparison Group

	Item	Regional Campus Students	Comparison Group
8.	Presenting ideas and information effectively in speaking to others	42%	44%
9.	Acquiring the ability to use computers	40%	39%
10.	Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life	37%	41%
11.	Becoming clearer about my own values and ethical standards	48%	49%
12.	Understanding myself-my abilities and interests	59%	61%
13.	Understanding mathematical concepts such as probabilities, proportions, etc.	39%	38%
14.	Understanding the role of science and technology in society	33%	36%

Table 17 (continued)
Percentages of Students Reporting They Made "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much" Progress: RC Students and National Comparison Group

	Item	Regional Campus Students	Comparison Group
15.	Putting ideas together to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas	45%	47%
16.	Developing the ability to learn on my own, pursue ideas, and find information I need	62%	60%
17.	Developing the ability to speak and understand another language	9%	19%
18.	Interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, textbooks, and on TV	31%	32%
19.	Developing an interest in political and economic events	28%	28%
20.	Seeing the importance of history for understanding the present as well as the past	32%	36%

Table 17 (continued)
Percentages of Students Reporting They Made "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much" Progress: RC Students and National Comparison Group

	Item	Regional Campus Students	Comparison Group
21.	Learning more about other parts of the world and other people (Asia, Africa, South America, etc.)	23%	29%
22.	Understanding other people and the ability get along with different kinds of people	48%	51%
23.	Developing good health habits and physical fitness	32%	38%

F. College Environment

Respondents were asked in the last section of the CCSEQ to provide their opinions concerning the college/campus environment. Sixty-nine percent of respondents said they would enroll at the campus if they were starting over again and an additional twenty-two percent said maybe they would enroll again. The majority of respondents said that all or most of the students they know are friendly, supportive, and approachable and the majority agreed all or most of their classes were challenging and worthwhile and advisors and clerical staff were helpful, considerate, and knowledgeable. Fifty-eight percent said their campus is a stimulating and exciting place to be all or most of the time. Forty-three percent said there were ample places for students to meet and study on campus and an additional fifty percent agreed there were a few places.

Satisfaction levels were similar between transfer and technology students and between all respondents and the comparison group. Notably, thirteen percent of students in the comparison group, but only seven percent of Regional Campuses students, said there were no places for students to meet and study on campus. This information is shown in **Table 18**.

Table 18
College Environment: Percentages of Responses

Item		Group		
		All	Transfer	Technology
1.	If you could start over again would you go to this campus?			
	Yes	69.2	63.6	73.9
	Maybe	22.2	25.1	20.9
	No	8.6	11.3	5.2
2.	How many of the students you know are friendly and supportive of one another?			
	All	12.9	13.2	10.9
	Most	67.5	66.2	75.4
	Some	18.0	18.9	13.3
	Few or none	1.6	1.7	0.4
3.	How many of your instructors at this campus do you feel are approachable, helpful, and supportive?			
	All	20.2	21.5	19.4
	Most	58.9	57.7	59.7
	Some	18.6	18.3	20.4
	Few or none	2.3	2.5	0.5
4.	How many of your courses at this campus would you describe as challenging, stimulating, and worthwhile?			
	All	14.9	11.9	16.1
	Most	60.8	62.9	63.0
	Some	21.7	22.9	19.0
	Few or none	2.6	2.3	1.9

Table 18 (continued)
College Environment: Percentages of Responses

	Item	All	Group: Transfer	Group: Technology
5.	How many of the counselors, advisors, and clerical staff you have had contact with would you describe as helpful, considerate, and knowledgeable?			
	All	22.0	20.9	24.3
	Most	46.5	44.2	50.0
	Some	23.6	26.3	19.0
	Few or none	7.9	8.6	6.7
6.	Do you feel that this campus is a stimulating and often exciting place to be?			
	All of the time	7.7	4.7	11.9
	Most of the time	45.0	44.0	43.3
	Some of the time	38.9	41.0	38.6
	Rarely or never	8.4	10.3	6.2
7.	Are there places on campus for you to meet and study with other students?			
	Yes, ample places	43.0	43.6	44.5
	Yes, a few places	50.0	49.3	48.8
	No	7.0	7.1	6.7

G. Comparisons Between Groups on Involvement in College Activities, Gains, and Satisfaction with the College Environment

A number of comparisons of CCSEQ results were made between groups and statistically significant differences were noted.

Table 19 compares activity scale means and gain and satisfaction scores among all Regional Campuses respondents, transfer students, technology students, and students in the national comparison group. Scale means are the mean total activity scores for each group. Gain scores are total scores in the estimates of gains section of the CCSEQ. Note mean gain scores were not given for the comparison group. Satisfaction scores are mean totals for five of the satisfaction with the college environment items. As noted previously, statistical tests are inappropriate to compare differences between Regional Campuses transfer and technology students; such tests were performed only to investigate differences between all Regional Campuses respondents and students in the comparison group.

As seen in the table, there were significant differences at the .01 level between Regional Campuses students and the comparison group for the art/music/theater, writing, science, and vocational skills activity scales. Regional Campuses students scored significantly higher in involvement in writing activities, but significantly lower in the other three areas. These differences were consistent between all, transfer, and technology students in each of the four areas, as shown in **Tables 20 through 23.**

Table 24 compares all Regional Campuses students by gender on the activity scales and gain and satisfaction scores. Females scored significantly higher at the .05 level in involvement in library activities and overall satisfaction. Females scored significantly higher at the .01 level in involvement in course learning activities. Finally, females scored significantly higher at the .001 level in involvement in writing activities.

Table 25 compares all Regional Campuses students by age group on the activity scales and gain and satisfaction scores. Students were classified into two age groups: age twenty-two or younger and age twenty-three or older. The older students scored significantly higher at the .05 level in involvement in vocational skills activities. They also scored significantly higher at the .01 level in involvement in course learning activities. Finally, students age twenty-three or above scored significantly higher at the .001 level than younger students in overall satisfaction with the college environment, but students age twenty-two or younger scored significantly higher at the same level in involvement with student acquaintances and in involvement in art/music/theater activities.

Table 26 compares students at each regional campus on the activity scales and gain and satisfaction scores. Involvement, gains, and satisfaction were similar across the campuses except for at Ashtabula, where students showed significantly greater involvement at the .05 level with library activities than at the other campuses, and at Ashtabula and Geauga, where students showed significantly greater involvement with vocational skills activities than at other campuses.

Table 19
Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Group

	Regional Campuses (All Students)	Regional Campuses (Transfer Students)	Regional Campuses (Technology Students)	National Sample (All Students)
Course Learning	24.3	24.5	24.1	24.6
Library	13.6	13.6	13.8	13.4
Faculty	15.6	15.5	15.4	15.6
Student Acquaintances	11.4	11.8	10.8	11.5
Art, Music, Theater	8.7*	9.0	8.1	9.1*
Writing	22.5*	22.8	22.2	20.9*
Science	14.7*	14.6	14.9	16.2*
Vocational Skills	14.4*	12.1	16.2	17.1*
Gains	51.9	51.9	51.9	
Satisfaction	14.1	13.9	14.4	14.0

* Significantly different at the .01 level

Table 20
Mean Art, Music, Theater Scores by Group:
Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group

	All Students	Transfer Students	Technology Students
Regional Campuses	8.7	9.0	8.1
Comparison Group	9.1	9.7	8.6

Table 21
Mean Writing Scores by Group:
Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group

	All Students	Transfer Students	Technology Students
Regional Campuses	22.5	22.8	22.2
Comparison Group	20.9	22.1	20.3

Table 22
Mean Science Scores by Group:
Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group

	All Students	Transfer Students	Technology Students
Regional Campuses	14.7	14.6	14.9
Comparison Group	16.2	16.8	17.0

Table 23
Mean Vocational Skills Scores by Group:
Regional Campuses Students and the Comparison Group

	All Students	Transfer Students	Technology Students
Regional Campuses	14.4	12.1	16.2
Comparison Group	17.1	14.8	20.5

Table 24
Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Gender

	Male	Female
Course Learning	23.6**	24.7**
Library	13.3*	13.9*
Faculty	15.3	15.7
Student Acquaintances	11.3	11.4
Art, Music, Theater	8.6	8.8
Writing	21.0***	23.3***
Science	15.0	14.5
Vocational Skills	14.3	14.5
Gains	51.6	51.8
Satisfaction	13.9*	14.2*

* Significantly different at the .05 level
** Significantly different at the .01 level
*** Significantly different at the .001 level

Table 25
Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Age

	Age 22 or Younger	Age 23 or Greater
Course Learning	23.9**	24.8**
Library	13.8	13.5
Faculty	15.5	15.6
Student Acquaintances	12.0***	10.6
Art, Music, Theater	9.2***	8.2***
Writing	22.6	22.4
Science	14.5	14.9
Vocational Skills	13.8*	15.0*
Gains	51.5	52.0
Satisfaction	13.8***	14.5***

* Significantly different at the .05 level
** Significantly different at the .01 level
*** Significantly different at the .001 level

Table 26
Mean Activity Scale, Gain, and Satisfaction Scores by Campus

	Ash.	E. L.	Gea.	Salem	Stark	Tru.	Tusc.
Course Learning	25.3	24.9	25.6	24.9	23.8	23.9	23.8
Library	15.1*	14.3	13.1	14.4	13.0	13.4	14.0
Faculty	16.4	16.2	16.4	15.7	15.0	15.5	15.3
Student Acquaintances	11.9	10.8	11.6	11.7	11.5	11.3	10.9
Art, Music, Theater	8.3	8.0	8.7	8.9	9.0	9.0	7.8
Writing	23.2	23.5	21.7	22.8	22.9	21.8	21.9
Science	13.8	16.3	14.6	14.8	14.7	13.9	15.8
Vocational Skills	17.1*	13.8	16.8*	15.1	12.1	13.2	15.8
Gains	53.4	51.3	52.9	51.3	51.7	51.2	52.0
Satisfaction	14.4	14.0	14.2	14.3	14.1	14.0	14.1

* Significantly greater than other campuses at the .05 level

H. Relationships Between Selected Variables and Involvement in College Activities, Gains, and Satisfaction with the College Environment

The relationships between involvement, gains, and satisfaction and a number of variables were investigated. Statistical tests were performed with each analysis.

Table 27 shows the relationship between the degree to which Regional Campuses CCSEQ respondents said their job responsibilities take time away from their school work and mean involvement, gain, and satisfaction scores. Correlations between these variables were statistically significant at the .05 level for two activity scales (library activities and involvement with faculty), but the correlations were very low even when statistically significant. The squares of the highest correlations (.07) show that less than one percent of the variance in student involvement was accounted for by job responsibilities. The conclusion is that there is no meaningful difference in involvement vis a vis job responsibilities.

Table 28 similarly shows the relationship between the degree to which respondents said family responsibilities take time away from their school work and involvement, gains, and satisfaction. Again, even though some correlations were significant at the .01 level and other at .05, less than two percent of the variance in student involvement was accounted for by family responsibilities in the scale with the highest correlation. Similarly, the conclusion is that there is no difference in student involvement, gains, or satisfaction due to family responsibilities.

Table 29 shows the relationship between involvement, gains, and satisfaction and students' total credit hours. The research question here was Do students show greater involvement, gains, and satisfaction as they attend the campuses for longer periods of time? Again, although all correlations were significant they were low; the highest correlation (.33) between duration of attendance and gains accounted for less than eleven percent of the variance in student involvement. The substantive answer to the research question was no; duration of attendance did not substantially affect involvement, gains, or satisfaction.

Table 27
Correlations Between Activity Scale Means, Gains, and Satisfaction and Job Responsibilities

	Scale Mean (All Students)	Correlation with Job Responsibilities
Course Learning	24.3	-.02
Library	13.6	-.07*
Faculty	15.6	-.07*
Student Acquaintances	11.4	.00
Art, Music, Theater	8.7	-.01
Writing	22.5	-.02
Science	14.7	.05
Vocational Skills	14.4	.07
Gains	51.9	.01
Satisfaction	14.1	-.06

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 28
Correlations Between Activity Scale Means, Gains, and Satisfaction and Family Responsibilities

	Scale Mean (All Students)	Correlation with Family Responsibilities
Course Learning	24.3	.13**
Library	13.6	-.04
Faculty	15.6	-.04
Student Acquaintances	11.4	.07
Art, Music, Theater	8.7	-.06*
Writing	22.5	-.06*
Science	14.7	.05
Vocational Skills	14.4	.08
Gains	51.9	.03
Satisfaction	14.1	.08**

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 29
Correlations Between Activity Scale Means and Total Credit Hours

	Scale Mean (All Students)	Correlation with Total Credit Hours
Course Learning	24.3	.16*
Library	13.6	.26*
Faculty	15.6	.18*
Student Acquaintances	11.4	.10*
Art, Music, Theater	8.7	.09*
Writing	22.5	.08*
Science	14.7	.18*
Vocational Skills	14.4	.31*
Gains	51.9	.33*
Satisfaction	14.1	.01

* Significant at the .01 level

I. Relationships Between Involvement in College Activities and Gains

Based upon analysis of data from the comparison group, Lehman (1992) grouped the items dealing with student gains into six factors: career preparation, the arts, communication skills, mathematics/science/ technology, personal and social development, and perspectives of the world. An investigation of the relationships between gain factors and involvement in college activities scales should suggest involvement in which activities is associated with gains in which areas.

Gain items for Regional Campuses students were grouped into the six factors suggested by Lehman (1992) and their relationships with different areas of involvement were investigated. Correlations between college activity scale means and gain factors were almost all significant at the .01 level. Moderate correlations of greater than .40 are shown in **Table 30.** This means that there was a fairly substantial relationship between involvement in vocational skills activities (such as practicing a procedure without supervision) and gains in career preparation; between involvement in arts, music, and theater (such as attending an art exhibit) and gains in understanding and enjoying the arts; between involvement in activities such as participation in class discussions and gains in communication skills; between involvement in writing and gains in communication skills; between involvement in activities such as completing a project using scientific methods and gains in understanding and using science, mathematics, and technology; and between activities such as comparing and contrasting different points of view presented in class and gains in personal and social development.

Table 30
Correlations Between Gain Factors and College Activity Scale Means

Gain Factor	College Activity Scale	Correlation
Career Preparation	Vocational Skills	.42
Arts	Art, Music, Theater	.50
Communication Skills	Course Learning	.43
Communication Skills	Writing	.44
Math, Science, Technology	Science	.44
Personal and Social Development	Course Learning	.44

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The introduction to this report cited a number of questions the CCSEQ was designed to answer. The summary of the CCSEQ results for the Regional Campuses is shown below in terms of these questions.

Who are the students and why are they at the campuses?

The answers to these questions, while familiar to faculty and staff at the campuses and consistent with prior research, nevertheless are important both in communicating with outside constituencies and for planning and decision-making within the system. Student ages span the range of options and are clustered at eighteen to twenty-two and twenty-eight to thirty-none. Students are predominately Caucasian and virtually all are native English-speakers.

Three out of four students are employed and one out of four works more than thirty hours per week. Three out of four report they have family responsibilities. More than one-half of students say job responsibilities take some or a lot of time away from their school work and nearly one-half agree that family responsibilities similarly take time away from their studies. Not surprising in view of these facts are the results that more than one-half of students spend less than ten hours per week preparing for class and a similar percentage spend less than three hours per week on campus when not in class.

More than one-half of students say their primary reason for enrollment is to prepare to transfer to a four-year college or university. Most of the remaining students report their primary goal is to gain the knowledge and skills necessary for obtaining a new job or for advancing or remaining current in their present employment.

How involved are they with their educational experience, or How extensively and productively do they use the facilities and opportunities the campuses provide?

As discussed in the introduction to this report, these may be the key questions in better understanding the factors related to students' success and persistence and the system's ability to support them. The CCSEQ asked students a series of questions about their involvement in college experiences and the results were compared and contrasted among groups of Regional Campuses students and between all students at the campuses and a national comparison group of community college students.

The results bear consideration both in an absolute and relative sense. In an absolute sense, the involvement of both Regional Campuses students and students in the comparison group is low. For nearly all the involvement scales, the mean score only represents half the maximum possible score on the CCSEQ. For example, both Regional Campuses students and the national comparison group scored a mean of thirteen on the Library Experiences scale which has a range of possible scores from seven to twenty-eight. These results are also consistent for Tennessee community college students (Douzenis & Murrell, 1992). Thus the involvement (as measured by the CCSEQ) of two-year college students has been shown to be low everywhere evidence is available.

Perhaps the more interesting question, then, deals with differences in involvement in a relative sense. Involvement levels were similar between all Regional Campuses students and those designated as transfer or technology students on all scales except Vocational Skills where, as expected, technology students showed greater involvement in vocational skills activities than transfer students or those in the general population. Females showed significantly more involvement than males in several areas and involvement was also different by age group. With only a few exceptions, involvement in the several areas was not significantly different by campus. Finally, there were statistically significant, but very low correlations between involvement and the impacts of job and family responsibilities on time for school work and between involvement and total credit hours accumulated.

There were clear differences in the level of involvement in four areas between Regional Campuses students and those in the comparison group. Involvement was significantly lower for Regional Campuses students in the areas of understanding and appreciating art, music, and theater; science activities; and vocational skills. Regional Campuses students were significantly more involved than students in the comparison group in writing activities.

What progress do they think they have made toward important educational goals?

Student progress and "value-added" is currently an area of interest both inside and outside the system. These questions have not previously been asked of a broad cross-section of Regional Campuses students and the results add to the growing body of assessment research. Students were asked to self-report the progress they have made in twenty-three areas of academic, vocational, social, and personal development as a result of their attendance.

On average, about one-third to one-half of the students report quite a bit or very much progress in each of the areas. Regional Campuses students report slightly less progress on most of the gain items than did students in the national sample of community college students. Progress in speaking and understanding a foreign language and in acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work was substantially less than that for the comparison group. Progress in writing clearly and effectively was considerably greater, however.

What are some of their impressions about the campuses?

Tinto (1987) explains that social integration and a sense of belonging are important for student retention. Knowing students' opinions about their campus, fellow students, courses, instructors, and counselors and support staff is helpful in providing for feedback in continuing to improve services and for recruitment and public relations efforts. The CCSEQ asks a number of questions in this area and the results were used to develop a satisfaction scale where mean scores were compared across groups.

Most Regional Campuses students would enroll at their campus if they could start over again and two-thirds to three-fourths had favorable impressions of their fellow students, instructors, courses, and counselors and support staff. Similar levels of satisfaction were found between transfer and technology students and with students in the comparison group. Females were significantly more satisfied than males and older students were more satisfied than younger students. Satisfaction was not significantly different across campuses and did not very with total credit hours.

Conclusions

Involvement in in-class and out-of-class activities was generally low for Regional Campuses students, but not unlike that of other students who have taken the CCSEQ. Students at the campuses were significantly less involved than students in the national comparison group in art/music/theater activities, science activities, and vocational skills activities. They were significantly more involved in writing activities. As the profile of the students responding to the questionnaire was similar to that for all students in the Regional Campuses, and assuming student involvement in the types of activities described by the CCSEQ is considered important, some serious concerns are raised by these results. Moreover, differences in involvement in writing activities between females and males and differences in involvement with student acquaintances between younger and older students, both statistically significant at the .001 level, suggest other areas of concern and the need for further inquiry.

Student self-reported progress in a number of areas was generally below that for the comparison group and was significantly lower in the areas of acquiring knowledge and skills appropriate to a specific job or type of work and of understanding and speaking a foreign language. The majority of students in the sample were freshmen, suggesting they may not have yet had time to show progress in many areas, yet roughly the same percentage of students in the comparison group would be classified as freshmen. Again, if student progress in the gain items of the CCSEQ is important for the Regional Campuses, these issues are of concern.

Satisfaction with the college environment, as for the comparison group, was fairly high for students at the campuses. Significantly greater satisfaction for older students may be another area of further inquiry.

Recognizing that the relationship between student progress and involvement is at least moderately high (as noted earlier), the implications of this study suggest the issue of how to develop policies and programs that maximize student involvement is important. Clearly there is a relationship for Regional Campuses students between involvement in vocational skills activities and gains in career preparation, between involvement in arts activities and progress in understanding and enjoying the arts, between involvement in science activities and increased understanding and use of scientific principles. The question is how can such involvement be increased?

Friedlander and MacDougall (in press) discuss a number of practices developed at Santa Barbara City College, one of the first community colleges where the CCSEQ was used, to increase the quantity and quality of student participation in learning activities. Strategies to increase student involvement in the classroom have included having faculty experiment with instructional practices, such as small group projects, that require such involvement. The use of instructional media materials, such as videodisc programs, has also encouraged more active learning at Santa Barbara. Increased student contact with faculty at Santa Barbara has resulted from an emphasis on faculty advising and through an effort to provide students with on-campus jobs related to their areas of study. Finally, increased student involvement in out-of-class activities at Santa Barbara has been facilitated by linking those activities to specific courses. For example, students enrolled in an English class are required to attend a theater production on-campus and then participate in a discussion. Other instructors have linked their courses to campus-based events such as a lecture series.

Friedlander and MacDougall provide the following conclusions on aiding students' educational achievement by the quantity and quality of students effort in learning opportunities provided by the college.

> If community colleges are to increase student involvement in learning, they must develop policies with that involvement in mind. For example, faculty hiring and evaluation procedures should require current or prospective instructors to discuss the use of instructional strategies that promote active learning. Student services programs should be established with the overriding goal of involving students as active participants in developing their own programs of study rather than treating them as passive recipients of information provided by college staff. Applying the principle of student involvement to policy development does not require colleges to invest additional resources. It simply requires colleges to rethink the ways in which educational opportunities for students are organized and delivered.

IV. REFERENCES

Douzenis, C., & Murrell, P. (1992, May). An analysis of students' experiences at selected community colleges in Tennessee: Findings from the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Forum, Atlanta, GA.

Friedlander, J. (1991). The quality of students' educational experiences at Santa Barbara City College. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara City College.

Friedlander, J., & MacDougall, P. (in press). Increasing student involvement in learning. Community College Review.

Knight, W. E. (1990a). Regional Campuses alumni survey of 1987, 1988, and 1989 associate degree recipients. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Knight, W. E. (1990b). Regional Campuses new freshmen survey. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Knight, W. E. (1990c). Time to associate degree study. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Knight, W. E. (1991a). Bachelors degree study: The experiences of May 1991 bachelors degree graduates of Kent State University who entered from the Regional Campuses. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Knight, W. E. (1991b). Regional Campuses non-returning student survey. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Knight, W. E. (1991c). Three Year Development Plan: 1990-1993. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Knight, W. E. (1992). Non-enrolling student study. Kent, OH: Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.

Lehman, P. W. (1992). CCSEQ: Test manual and comparative data. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Pace, C. R. (1984). Measuring the quality of college student experiences. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges AUG 07 1992